



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

X.—*The Publication of Martial's Poems*

BY PROFESSOR EVAN T. SAGE

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

I begin with a discussion of the meanings in Martial of the words *liber* and *libellus*. The other descriptive terms used by the poet, such as *carmen*, *epigramma*, *versus*, *disticha*, *nugae*, and *ioci*, offer no difficulty. There are various uses, however, of *liber* and *libellus*. *Liber* is of course used in the sense we are familiar with, as in *liber quintus* and just as we speak of the fifth book of the *Aeneid*. If *librum* at the end of the Preface to Book XII is right (the MSS. disagree), it means something smaller than a book in the ordinary sense. That *liber* may have such a meaning is shown by such a poem as IV, 10, where *liber* and *libellus* are both used of the same thing. In X, 1 the poet advises the reader to stop in the middle of the *liber* and thus convert it into a *libellus*, but in XIV, 2 he says that his *libellus* is so arranged that the same thing may be done to it. In V, 2 he contrasts his previous *quattuor libellos* with his new *quintus liber*. It appears then that Martial sometimes uses the two words in their natural relations of size and also uses them as synonymous with one another. *Libellus* then is not necessarily a short book as distinguished from a long one, nor a book of poems as distinguished from one of prose. If on the one hand *libellus* is interchangeable with *liber*, on the other it is synonymous with *carmen* or *epigramma*. In X, 19 we have the poem which Martial sent to Pliny. The poet commands his muse to take to Pliny his *libellus*. In *Ep.* III, 21 Pliny refers to the *versiculi* which Martial wrote in his praise, and quotes verses 12–21 of this poem. Thus we have a complete identification of the *libellus* which Martial sent to Pliny: it is X, 19. I have no other absolutely sure case where *libellus* must mean one poem. There are however several instances where it may have this meaning: cf. III, 99; V, 36; IX, 49, etc.

It is probable, as has often been pointed out, that many of Martial's poems appeared first in the form of occasional and separate verses (*libelli* in the sense last mentioned), and that these fugitive productions were from time to time collected and published in the larger *libri*. Probably many if not most of the poems in any *liber* were already known to larger or smaller groups of readers. When material failed, or when some special reason existed, other poems might be included. Some of these might be new poems, such as dedicatory verses, or old poems that had for some reason never been published. To the latter class would belong such a poem as x, 61, on Eroton. Eroton died about 89, apparently, and in the next *liber* the epitaph which Martial had written was published (v, 34). This was natural and appropriate. It would not be natural and appropriate to write and publish a new tribute to her memory ten years later (if, as I believe, this poem appeared in the second enlarged edition of Book x, published in 98). It is more probable that the poet tried several times before he succeeded in composing the admirable verses known now as v, 34 (v, 37 also deals with Eroton). Among these rejected experiments was a poem that was later deemed worthy of publication, and preserved as x, 61. Such a poem as i, 66 shows that the author had on hand unpublished material. Martial here suggests that the plagiarist should follow the safer course of buying unpublished verses, and with them, the author's silence.

It is certain that there were these collected *libri* in the poet's lifetime, and probably then the work of his own hand. The proof may be found in such poems as vii, 17, ix, 84, viii, 3, etc.

Libellus may then mean anything in Martial from one poem to a collection usually described as a *liber*. Obviously, the question of the time and manner of publication of the Epigrams becomes more rather than less complicated. Shall we say that a poem is published only when it appears in a *liber* though known to some readers long before? I shall, despite

these doubts, continue to regard a poem as published when it appears in a *liber* unless we can show that it did or probably did appear earlier or in different form. The extent of the publication of individual poems (*libelli*), and the manner in which this was effected, should be investigated.

If we can believe that a poem might be published as a separate *libellus* and also as part of a *liber*, some difficulties of interpretation will be lessened. Some poems refer to the books of which they are a part, though they should be separate. Among these is vii, 17, which is a letter of transmittal, so to speak, accompanying seven *libelli* which the poet sent to Iulius Martialis. It is impossible to believe that one of Martial's oldest and dearest friends had never before had any of the poems. This friend is frequently mentioned in the Epigrams: cf. i, 15, iii, 5, iv, 64, vi, 1. Yet we find Martial sending him at this time the seven books of Epigrams. Possibly, it may be urged, these include the earlier works, the Liber Spectacolorum and Books xiii and xiv, but the reference to *lasciva Thalia* as Martial's muse makes this possibility slight. The gift was undoubtedly Books i-vii of the Epigrams, corrected by the poet himself. There are two ways of explaining the presence within Book vii of a poem transmitting Book vii with others: (1) The poem was a real letter of transmittal and appeared separately as well as in its present place in the book. (2) The poem appeared only separately, and was included at this point by a later editor, who chose this particular place for it because of the numerical *septem* in it. The testimony of the MSS. indicates that we now have substantially the text as Martial made it up for his *libri*; if an editor or editors had worked over a number of fugitive poems in addition to those which Martial had already included in the published *libri*, we should expect to find greater variety in content and arrangement as a result of this extra and later expansion of the *libri* as published by Martial. I incline, therefore, to the former theory, that the poem was sent to Martialis both separately and in the book in its present place.

(For further discussion of successive editions in Martial's life see below.)

Another difficult poem is 1, 2. In this poem the author states that a codex edition of Martial may be purchased from the dealer or publisher Secundus. It is tempting to believe that the poem was an advertisement (see my paper, "The Profits of Literature in Ancient Rome," *C.W.* x, 170 ff., and Ball, "A Forerunner of the Advertising Agent," *C.J.* II, 165 ff.). There are two places where the poem would have been valuable in that way, in a contemporary *volumen* edition, and separately published and posted on the *pila* of the booksellers. The purpose of advertising is to stimulate a demand and furnish information as to how the demand may be satisfied, not to remind one how the demand has been satisfied. The place for this poem was then anywhere outside of the codex edition to which it refers, but the interest of the reader of the advertisement would not be diminished if he found the same poem in the edition which he purchased, though this would be a secondary value only and incidental to the main purpose. It would be interesting to know whether Lowell had this poem in mind when he wrote an advertisement for his *Fable for Critics*, which was later used as a title page (cf. Putnam, *Authors and Their Public in Ancient Times*,³ 219). The parallel is so close that I can easily believe that Martial did exactly the same thing.

There is another problem in connection with this poem. What did this codex edition of Secundus contain? Birt, in his revision of Müller's *Handbuch*, I, 346, expresses the opinion that the Preface and the first two poems of Book I do not belong to the original edition, but to a revised edition containing selections from Books I-VII. My own dissent has been indicated. Immisch, *Herm.* XLVI, 481 ff. thinks that this revised edition contained not selections, but Books I-VII complete, as travellers would want the longest possible books. I suggest that the codex edition was contemporaneous with the *volumen* edition, that the contents of the two were the same,

(unless the codex edition contained Books I and II), and that there was no edition of Books I-VII at all. (One thinks at once of the gift to Martialis, but that was merely a special copy, prepared as a gift, and not necessarily as an edition.) As far back as Schneidewin, at least, this theory of an edition of the first seven books has been advanced, but has never found general acceptance. In addition to the arguments previously advanced, it may be noted that in the case of Book X the MSS. clearly indicate that there were two editions, of different dates, but both in the life of the author. Why are there not similar indications in the case of Books I-VII? There are variants that are clearly ancient, but they are not peculiar to these books, and are not closely and regularly associated with any of the families of MSS. Perhaps these earlier editions were in every other case than Book X absorbed in the recensions of Gennadius and others, but I do not believe it. I know of no real reason to believe that there was an edition of Books I-VII, either complete or in excerpts. Birt's opinion is based on his assumption that *artare* (I, 2, 3) means 'to make a collection of excerpts.' This assumption, in turn, is necessary to enable him to support his theory that parchment books were cheaper than those of papyrus. It apparently is true that in XII, 5, 2, Martial refers to a collection of poems from Books X and XI, using the words *artatus labor est*. This abridged edition is supposed to be the same as the *timidumque brevemque libellum* of XII, 11, 7. In Hieronymus, *Ep.* XLVIII, 14, *artavit* may have a similar meaning; but in no other passage, so far as I know, is this the natural interpretation (see the *Thesaurus*, s.v.). Horace, *Epist.* I, 20, 8 (*in breve cogi*), sometimes cited as a parallel, may be differently explained. The closest parallel is Martial, XIV, 190, which reads:

Titus Livius in membranis

Pellibus exiguis artatur Livius ingens,
Quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit.

It is not to be assumed that this was a collection of excerpts or even a summary: this takes away the point of the second verse. Yet Birt is compelled now to do this, as, according to him, not even on parchment could a complete Livy be cheaper than the Monobiblos Properti. His former assumption (*Antike Buchwesen*, 86) of some form of shorthand is perhaps nearer right, if anything is needed. It is reasonable to suppose that ancient codices might vary in size as did those written during the Middle Ages, and all Livy might be gotten into a codex that, at least when compared with the numerous volumina that would be required, would be small indeed. This is the easiest interpretation of XIV, 190. That there were such summaries as Birt mentions for Livy and Virgil, is certain; that *artare* means to make such a summary, is not. The word might even be publishers' slang for the production of a codex. Books of remarkably small size were known in antiquity, as we learn from Pliny's account of a codex of the *Iliad* so small that it could be contained in a nut shell (*N.H.* VII, 85.) It does not follow that this Livy was such a curiosity, but the book trade was capable of producing such novelties. It is not then certain that Secundus had for sale an edition including selections from Books I-VII.

While bulk would no doubt be an attraction to travellers with long distances to go, there is little positive evidence for a complete edition of these books. Immisch believes that this codex edition is at the basis of our text tradition. He thinks that the first recto page contained a portrait of the author and poems 1 and 2 of Book I. On the verso was the prose portion of the Preface. The next page contained the verse portion of the Preface, followed by 1, 3 and 4. The Gennadian family of MSS. (G) omits poems 1 and 2 entirely. The Vulgate family (V) has them between the prose and verse portions of the Preface. Immisch says that G is descended from a copy in which the first recto page was illegible, V from a copy which had the first sheet bound wrong side out. This theory is ingenious and may be correct. It would not however

prove that the codex edition contained anything more than Book I. This edition was for travellers and anyone else who wanted Martial for a constant companion. The plural *libellos* in 1, 2, 1, repeated by *hos* in verse 3, points to a series of separate codices rather than to one large one. If *libelli* equals *libri* in this passage, there were the Liber Spectaculorum, the juvenile works, Books XIII, XIV, I, and possibly II available for publication in codex form at this time.

This brings me to another point, the relative dates of publication of Books I and II. It is generally assumed (since the publication of Stobbe's paper in *Phil.* xxvi, 62 ff.) that Books I and II were published together. I should like to offer the suggestion that they were first published in this form by Secundus in the codex edition, Book II, and possibly Book I, having previously appeared in *volumen* form. In III, 1 Martial speaks of *priorem librum* and of *verna liber*, as if he had previously issued only one book of the series. This difficulty has long been noted though not explained. There is another difficulty that is usually not noticed by editors, in II, 93. In this, the last poem of Book II, Regulus asks where Book I is, as what he has in his hands is Book II. The poet replies that Book I is "too modest" (for what?) but that Book II may easily be made into Book I by erasure. This suggests that the single predecessor of Book III was Book II. I know of no satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon. However I shall venture a suggestion. Martial planned two *libri*, to be known as I and II, before he published either one; he published Book II first, his book containing mainly poems of earlier date (Friedländer, Einleitung, 53), calling it Book II because that was what it would eventually be; for some reason the publication of Book I was delayed until after Book III had been published, this book having been written in Gaul; final accomplishment of his plan was reserved for the codex edition of Secundus. It could not have been delayed very long, as there were four *libri* in circulation in 89, as we know from V, 2, 5. This theory will account for the singular

priorem librum in III, 1, 3, for the absence of Book I noted in II, 93, and for the far from restrained self-satisfaction expressed in I, 1. I should suppose that the edition of Secundus, containing Books I-II, followed closely upon the heels of Book III, and that this was the first appearance of Book I. It must, however, be regarded as possible that the codex edition contained only Book I. In either case, Immisch's ideas of the arrangement of the first pages might be sound.

I come at last to the relations of the various publishers of Martial, for I believe that they were all publishers as well as dealers. Trypho was both, as we can see by comparing IV, 72, XIII, 2, and Quintilian, Preface to the *Institutio Oratoria*. Pollius (I, 113) was the publisher of Martial's youthful works. It is not known that he was a dealer, but this seems reasonable. Probably he had no connection with Martial's later works, and the poem cited is in the nature of an advertisement. According to I, 117, Atrectus was *dominus* of a shop in the Argiletum, where a fine volumen of Martial could be had for five denarii. If he was important enough to sell such editions, and to be mentioned in Martial's poems, he was probably a publisher too. The same is true of Secundus, especially if my suggestion is sound, that he was the first to issue Books I and II together. Birt (*Buchwesen*, 358 and 360) thought that Pollius was the real publisher and that Atrectus and Secundus were his agents. He also suggested (*ib.* 359) that the three men published Book I at common expense. There seems no other evidence for his assumption that there was a publishers' association for the promotion of their general interests — an attractive hypothesis too rashly accepted by Putnam (p. 242) and Mumby (*Romance of Bookselling*, 10). Atrectus and Secundus were thought to be two names for one man by Becker (*Handb.* I, 257 and 407), and this theory has recently been revived by Peck (*C.P.* IX, 77-78). It seems impossible to accept it for topographical reasons. Haenny, *Schriftsteller und Buchhändler im alten Rom*², 69, thought that Atrectus and Secundus were agents of Trypho, but the two

references to Trypho in Martial do not give us any reason to think that Trypho had anything to do with Book I. This would render impossible the view of Friedländer, Einleitung, 16, and Dziatzko, *Rh. Mus.* XLIX, 570, that Trypho handled Books I-IV at least. Dziatzko thinks that Atrectus and Trypho were the only real publishers. It seems, however, that all four were publishers. Perhaps Atrectus specialized in fine volumen editions, Secundus in pocket editions in codex form. If this is so, their editions were not competitive, and the poet himself arranged to have his works offered to the public in all the possible forms.